

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**PENTIUK, COUVREUR &  
KOBILJAK, P.C.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**ADVANCED ROOFING, INC.  
d/b/a ADVANCED ROOFING - MIDWEST**

**Defendant.**

---

**Case No. 16-12863**

**Honorable Denise Page Hood**

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE  
MOTION TO CERTIFY CLASS**

On August 4, 2016, Plaintiff filed the instant class action complaint against Defendant, along with a Motion to Certify the Class. Defendant has yet to be served and no scheduling order has yet been entered in this case.

Although Rule 23 of the Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a class certification shall be decided as soon as practicable after the commencement of an action, “this does not mandate precipitate action. The court should defer decision on certification pending discovery if the existing record is inadequate for resolving the relevant issues.” *In re Am. Medical Systems, et al.*, 75 F.3d 1069, 1086 (6th Cir. 1996). Other than the Complaint, there is no record before the Court. The Supreme Court requires district courts to conduct a “rigorous analysis” into whether the prerequisites

of Rule 23 are met before certifying a class. *General Tel. Co. v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 161 (1982). A class is not maintainable as a class action by virtue of its designation as such in the pleadings. *In re Am. Medical*, 75 F.3d at 1079. A defendant has due process rights in an action, including an opportunity to respond to the complaint, to conduct any discovery on any of the named plaintiffs or submit a brief to the district court regarding class certification issues. *Id.* at 1086.

In this case, as noted above, Defendant has not been served, has not filed a response to the Complaint and has not had an opportunity to determine whether discovery is required on the class certification issue. The Court at this time cannot make the “rigorous analysis” required to determine whether Plaintiff meets class certification requirements.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion to Certify Class (**Doc. No. 2**) is DENIED without prejudice. Plaintiff may refile its motion after Defendant has been served and has had the opportunity to respond to the Complaint and the class allegations.

Dated: August 8, 2016

s/Denise Page Hood

HON. DENISE PAGE HOOD  
CHIEF JUDGE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on August 8, 2016, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Shawna C. Burns

Case Manager